DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 084 595 CS 500 481

AUTHOR Jandt, Fred E.
TITLE Sex Differences in the Factor Structure of Berger's Expressed Acceptance of Others Scale.
PUB DATE Jul 73
NOTE 17p.; Report delivered to the Department of Speech, State University of New York, Brockport, New York, July, 1973

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Standards; Communication (Thought Transfer); Factor Analysis; *Factor Structure; Group Behavior; Individual Development; Interaction; *Peer Acceptance; Persuasive Discourse; Self Concept; *Self Esteem; *Sex Differences; Sex Discrimination; Social Adjustment; Social Behavior; *Verbal Communication
IDENTIFIERS *Berger (Emmanuel M)

ABSTRACT

Emanuel M. Berger's scale for testing the expressed acceptance of others is based on statements describing behavior, particularly verbal communicative behavior, of others, in a study of 561 subjects, Berger's scale evidenced need of modification in explaining small group interaction and especially the differing attitudinal responses of males' and females' expression of relative acceptance of other people. "Acceptance of others" has a different meaning to males than to females, perhaps due to culturally learned factors. Berger's scale has a male bias, but other factors proved reliable, leading to the conclusion that, with a control factor for sex, the Berger scale is a valuable instrument in communication research because of its focus on verbal behavior. For example, Berger's finding that the expression of a positive self-concept usually indicates a high degree of acceptance of others was found reliable. (CH)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Fred E. Jandt
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

ED 084595

SEX DIFFERENCES IN THE FACTOR STRUCTURE OF BERGER'S EXPRESSED ACCEPTANCE OF OTHERS SCALE

Fred E. Jandt

Rogers' (1951) 18th proposition--"When the individual perceives and accepts into one consistent and integrated system all his sensory and visceral experiences, then he is necessarily more understanding of others and is more accepting of others as separate individuals"--generated several measuring instruments designed to validate it. This construct of "acceptance of self and others," as defined by Sheerer (1949) and Berger (1950), is the subject of Likert-type rating scales developed by Phillips (1951), Berger (1950 and 1952), and Fey (1954 and 1955). This series of studies consistently demonstrated a significant and positive correlation between expressed acceptance of self and expressed acceptance of others.

Berger's 64-item questionnaire for expressed acceptance of self and expressed acceptance of others is considered by Shaw and Wright (1967) to be the most carefully developed scale for measuring attitudes toward self and to have more evidence of validity than most attitude scales. Berger, for example, did study the relationships between his scales and MMPI scores (1953 and 1955).

Berger's definitions of the person who is accepting of others are shown in Table I. The definitions of acceptance of others tend to describe behavior

- -

Insert Table I about here

- -

toward others, particularly verbal behavior of a generalized sort. Yet, attempts to correlate expressed acceptance of others with behavior generally have not been successful. Scher (1955) could not demonstrate a relationship to actual acceptance by a group; Streitfeld (1959) could not demonstrate a relationship to psychotherapeutic ability as rated by supervisors. But Jandt

CS 500 181

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

(1970) did demonstrate a relationship for males to the verbal behavior of group maintaining acts which draw a group together, raise group unity, and break deadlocks, or which, in other words, are associated with group facilitation to insure the continuation of interaction. Maffeo and Ware (1971) also demonstrated a relationship through communication denial in small groups to the feelings of alienation of isolation and powerlessness.

PROBLEM

While Rogers' 18th proposition has generated a great deal of research to demonstrate the relationship between expressed acceptance of self and expressed acceptance of others, the available measuring instruments for expressed acceptance of others generally have not been predictive of actual behavior. However, the Berger scale of expressed acceptance of others, in which the nature of behavior toward others of focus in the instrument is verbal behavior of a generalized sort, may be predictive of some behaviors and attitudes in small group interaction. The purpose of this investigation was to analyze the Berger scale of expressed acceptance of others in an effort to clarify the relationship to behavior.

METHOD

The sample for this investigation was comprised of 561 subjects (257 males, 304 females) distributed as follows: 25 subjects from Cleveland State University (19 males, 6 females), 78 from Cornell University (33 males, 45 females), 86 from Miami-Dade Junior College (48 males, 38 females), 233 from State University College at Brockport (82 males, 151 females), 66 from the University of Maine (37 males, 29 females), and 73 from Western Illinois University (38 males, 35 females).[1]

---

[1]The author wishes to express his gratitude to Miss Susan Kogler, Cleveland State University; Dr. Jack A. Barwind, Cornell University; Miss Joan Shields, Miami-Dade Junior College; Dr. Peter E. Kane, State University College at Brockport; Dr. Maryan[illegible]n, University of Maine; and Dr. Robert Holton, Western Illinois University.

The broad-based geographical distribution of subjects prevented the scale being administered on the same day or by the same experimenter. However, the scale was administered near the end of the 1970 Fall semester, or near the beginning of the 1971 Spring semester to freshmen and sophomores in communication and speech courses.

The 28 scale items for expressed acceptance of others were taken from Berger (1950) after comparison with the reprint in Shaw and Wright (1967) revealed only minor grammatical differences. The items were preceded by printed instructions similar to those suggested by Berger, except with regard to anonymity of response. Each administrator was requested to explain that the study was for test validation purposes and that responses would be held confidential and would not affect course grades. The scales were scored after the instructions given in Shaw and Wright.

RESULTS

Separate factor analyses were performed for males and females, using principal component solutions and varimax rotations. Nine factors were isolated for both males and females. Table II identifies the five factors for males which include

- -

Insert Table II about here

- -

at least three items each; Table III identifies the six factors for females which

- -

Insert Table III about here

- -

include at least three items each.

The different factor analyses for males and females suggest that the scale is not measuring exactly the same things for males and females. However, they indicate three commonly shared factors: (1) Male Factor I and Female Factor IV correspond generally to Berger's seventh definition and seem to imply the active manipulation of other people; (2) Male Factor II and Female Factor II correspond generally to Berger's third definition and seem to imply persuasion or the verbal manipulation of others; and (3) Male Factor IV and Female Factor III correspond generally to Berger's sixth definition and seem to imply alienation or isolation from others.

The responses from males and females were then analyzed with the Finn univariate and multivariate analysis of variance, covariance, and regression program,[2] which indicated an F-ratio for multivariate test of equality of mean vectors of 5.5655 ($P < .0001$) and a Bartlett's chi square test for significance of successive canonical variates of 140.0151 ($P < .0001$), indicating an overall sex difference in the responses to the instrument. Table IV shows the step down F, probability, and standarized discriminant function coefficient for each test item. While the responses indicate a sex difference in the overall instrument, scale items 26, 29, 33, 36, and 47 contribute minimally to this difference. A second Finn analysis omitting these five items revealed only minor differences from the original analysis. New values are shown in parentheses in Table IV. Second factor analyses for both males and females were performed after deleting the responses to these five items, even though three of the five items contributed to the three previously identified factors. As might be expected, then,

- - - -

the first previously identified factor of active manipulation of other people remained as the only commonly shared factor for this sample.

REPLICATION

Weiss (1970, 1971) has been critical of the use of principal components factor analysis for most counseling-related research. To meet these objections and on the basis of the above factor analyses, items 4, 19, 23, 26, 27. 36, 44, 46, and 60 were selected for a shortened version. The items were preceded by printed instructions similar to those suggested by Berger, except with regard to anonymity of response. This shortened version was administered to all the students (N = 383 183 males and 200 females) attending the first class meeting of a freshman level communication course at the State University College at Brockport, Fall semester, 1971. The items were scored after the instructions given in Shaw and Wright (1967).

Separate factor analyses were again performed for males and females using principal component solutions and varimax rotations. The same three factors

- - - -

fashions. Berger reports developing his scales with a sample of 195 students in first-year sociology or psychology classes. This sample was composed of 142 males and 53 females, an approximate 3:1 ratio, suggesting a male bias in the test instrument, additionally bringing to question the scale's use in studies which do not control for sex.

The emergence of several factors in the different factor analyses suggest additional research to determine the factor's additivity to form a single score representative of a subject's relative degree of expressed acceptance of others. The analyses do isolate three commonly shared factors closely paralleling three of Berger's original definitions. The items forming these three factors are perhaps the most viable items representing a subject's relative degree of expressed acceptance of others.

In brief, the Berger scale of expressed acceptance of others may prove to be a valuable instrument in personality and communication research because of its focus on verbal behavior.

Table I

BERGER'S DEFINITIONS OF
THE PERSON WHO IS ACCEPTING OF OTHERS

	DEFINITION	ITEM NUMBERS
1.	He does not reject, hate or pass judgment against other persons when their behavior or standards seem to him to be contradictory to his own.	3, 21, 50, 55
2.	He does not attempt to dominate others.	22, 25, 49, 56
3.	He does not attempt to assume responsibility for others.	26, 30, 44, 60
4.	He does not deny the worth of others or their equality as persons with him. This does not imply equality in regard to specific achievements. He feels neither above nor below the people he meets.	29, 32, 43, 47
5.	He shows a desire to serve others.	5, 10, 33, 57
6.	He takes an active interest in others and shows a desire to create mutually satisfactory relations with them.	4, 27, 36, 39
7.	In attempting to advance his own welfare, he is careful not to infringe on the rights of others.	19, 23, 46, 54

Table II

FACTORS IDENTIFIED FOR MALES

BERGER'S DEFINITION	ITEM		FACTOR LOADING
		FACTOR I	
7	46.	I feel that for the most part one has to fight his way through life. That means that people who stand in the way will be hurt.	79
7	19.	I usually ignore the feelings of others when I'm accomplishing some important end.	62
5	33.	I enjoy doing little favors for people even if I don't know them well.	61
7	23.	I see no objection to stepping on other people's toes a little if it'll help get me what I want in life.	55
7	54.	If people are weak and inefficient I'm inclined to take advantage of them. I believe you must be strong to achieve your goals.	54
		FACTOR II	
3	60.	If someone I know is having difficulty in working things out for himself, I like to tell him what to do.	75
3	44.	When someone asks for advice about some personal problem, I'm most likely to say, "It's up to you to decide," rather than tell him what he should do.	67
3	26.	I often tell people what they should do when they're having trouble in making a decision.	67
1	3.	I can be comfortable with all varieties of people--from the highest to the lowest.	-40

Table II--continued

FACTORS IDENTIFIED FOR MALES

BERGER'S DEFINITION	ITEM		FACTOR LOADING
		FACTOR III	
3	30.	Sometimes people misunderstand me when I try to keep them from making mistakes that could have an important effect on their lives.	-74
2	22.	The person you marry may not be perfect, but I believe in trying to get him (or her) to change along desirable lines.	47
1	55.	I'm easily irritated by people who argue with me.	46
		FACTOR IV	
6	36.	I prefer to be alone rather than have close friendships with any of the people around me.	73
6	27.	I enjoy myself most when I'm alone, away from other people.	67
6	4.	I can become so absorbed in the work I'm doing that it doesn't bother me not to have intimate friends.	-65
1	21.	There's no sense in compromising. When people have values I don't like, I just don't care to have much to do with them.	46
1	50.	I can be friendly with people who do things which I consider wrong.	45
		FACTOR V	
5	5.	I don't approve of spending time and energy in doing things for other people. I believe in looking to my family and myself more and letting others shift for themselves.	-78
6	39.	I seldom worry about other people. I'm really pretty self-centered.	64

Table II--continued

FACTORS IDENTIFIED FOR MALES

BERGER'S DEFINITION	ITEM		FACTOR LOADING
4	43.	I believe that people should get credit for their accomplishments, but I very seldom come across work that deserves praise.	-59
5	10.	I don't approve of doing favors for people. If you're too agreeable they'll take advantage of you.	-40

Table III

FACTORS IDENTIFIED FOR FEMALES

BERGER'S DEFINITION	ITEM		FACTOR LOADING
		FACTOR I	
4	32.	There are very few times when I compliment people for their talents or jobs they've done.	72
5	5.	I don't approve of spending time and energy in doing things for other people. I believe in looking to my family and myself more and letting others shift for themselves.	57
1	55.	I'm easily irritated by people who argue with me.	48
6	39.	I seldom worry about other people. I'm really pretty self-centered.	-44
		FACTOR II	
3	26.	I often tell people what they should do when they're having trouble in making a decision.	77
3	60.	If someone I know is having difficulty in working things out for himself, I like to tell him what to do.	75
3	44.	When someone asks for advice about some personal problem, I'm most likely to say, "It's up to you to decide," rather than tell him what he should do.	-69
		FACTOR III	
6	4.	I can become so absorbed in the work I'm doing that it doesn't bother me not to have any intimate friends.	79
6	36.	I prefer to be alone rather than have close friendships with any of the people around me.	-78
6	27.	I enjoy myself most when I'm alone, away from other people.	-75

Table III--continued

FACTORS IDENTIFIED FOR FEMALES

BERGER'S DEFINITION	ITEM		FACTOR LOADING
		FACTOR IV	
7	23.	I see no objection to stepping on other people's toes a little if it'll help get me what I want in life.	-76
2	25.	I try to get people to do what I want them to do, in one way or another.	-63
7	19.	I usually ignore the feelings of others when I'm accomplishing some important end.	-56
7	46.	I feel that for the most part one has to fight his way through life. That means that people who stand in the way will be hurt.	-54
7	54.	If people are weak and inefficient I'm inclined to take advantage of them. I believe you must be strong to achieve your goals.	-52
2	22.	The person you marry may not be perfect, but I believe in trying to get him (or her) to change along desirable lines.	-33
		FACTOR V	
4	29.	I feel neither above nor below the people I meet.	80
4	47.	I can't help feeling superior (or inferior) to most of the people I know.	61
1	3.	I can be comfortable with all varieties of people--from the highest to the lowest.	57
		FACTOR VI	
4.	43.	I believe that people should get credit for their accomplishments, but I very seldom come across work that deserves praise.	66

Table III--continued

FACTORS IDENTIFIED FOR FEMALES

BERGER'S DEFINITION	ITEM		FACTOR LOADING
2	49.	I don't hesitate to urge people to live by the same high set of values which I have for myself.	57
5	57.	I don't see much point to doing things for others unless they can do you some good later on.	49
2	56.	When I'm dealing with younger persons, I expect them to do what I tell them.	40

Table IV

ITEM ANALYSIS WITH FINN PROGRAM*

ITEM	STEP DOWN F	PROBABILITY LESS THAN	STANDARDIZED COEFFICIENT
3	1.3053	.2535	.1097 (.1131)
4	6.6091	.0104	.1443 (.1277)
5	24.5526	.0001	-.2053 (-.2017)
10	4.0082	.0458	.0579 (.0582)
19	19.2612	.0001	-.2029 (-.2030)
21	6.8730	.0090	-.1551 (-.1582)
22	39.3392	.0001	-.4943 (-.4853)
23	5.0647	.0249	-.1334 (-.1348)
25	1.1282	.2882	-.1361 (-.1238)
26	.5458	.4604	.0456
27	1.5747 (1.5178)	.2100 (.2183)	.1327 (.1519)
29	.1308	.7176	.0141
30	1.8106 (2.3078)	.1789 (.1293)	.1684 (.1565)
32	.7442 (.7658)	.3888 (.3818)	-.0824 (-.0816)
33	.8658	.3525	-.0348
36	.2556	.6135	.0375
39	3.8469 (3.8853)	.0504 (.0492)	.2049 (.2029)
43	2.0202 (1.9885)	.1558 (.1590)	-.1374 (-.1353)
44	6.5455 (6.7564)	.0108 (.0096)	-.1868 (-.1837)
46	.4536 (.4834)	.5010 (.4874)	-.1103 (-.1055)
47	.5186	.4718	.0489
49	2.5750 (2.8706)	.1092 (.0908)	.1476 (.1495)
50	2.8902 (2.8271)	.0897 (.0933)	-.1621 (-.1643)
54	1.3909 (1.5147)	.2385 (.2188)	.1133 (.1192)
55	3.1222 (3.6662)	.0778 (.0561)	.1511 (.1627)
56	1.5740 (1.7788)	.2102 (.1829)	.1901 (.1985)
57	2.2831 (2.4564)	.1315 (.1177)	-.1600 (-.1673)
60	2.6316 (2.5196	.1054 (.1131)	-.1882 (-.1693)

*Values in parentheses refer to a second analysis.

Table V

ANALYSIS OF SHORTENED VERSION

ITEM NUMBER	MALES MEAN	MALES S.D.	MALES FACTOR LOADING	FEMALES MEAN	FEMALES S.D.	FEMALES FACTOR LOADING
FACTOR I: THE ACTIVE MANIPULATION OF OTHER PEOPLE						
19	4.14	.86	-.60	4.45	.75	-.74
23	4.27	.72	-.65	4.51	.67	-.80
46	4.13	.92	-.75	4.37	.83	-.61
SUBTOTAL	12.54	1.73		13.28	1.67	
FACTOR II: PERSUASION OR THE VERBAL MANIPULATION OF OTHERS						
26	3.16	1.09	.79	3.37	1.10	.86
44	2.40	1.18	.60	2.54	1.20	.56
60	3.22	1.12	.78	3.48	1.13	.83
SUBTOTAL	8.83	2.47		9.40	2.53	
FACTOR III: ALIENATION OR ISOLATION FROM OTHERS						
4	1.67	.88	-.64	1.59	.98	-.72
27	4.03	1.06	.84	4.01	.99	.82
36	4.64	.73	.83	4.64	.80	.87
SUBTOTAL	10.32	1.55		10.24	1.43	
TOTAL	31.70	3.20		32.93	3.20	
REVISED 4	4.33	.88	.64	4.42	.98	.72
REVISED SUBTOTAL	12.94	2.11		13.10	2.22	
REVISED TOTAL	34.31	3.57		35.62	4.23	

REFERENCES

Berger, Emanuel M. The Relation Between Expressed Acceptance of Self and Expressed Acceptance of Others. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 1950.

_____. The Relation Between Expressed Acceptance of Self and Expressed Acceptance of Others. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 1952, 47, 778-782.

_____. Relationships Among Acceptance of Self, Acceptance of Others, and MMPI Scores. The American Psychologist. 1953, 8, 320-321.

_____. Relationships Among Acceptance of Self, Acceptance of Others, and MMPI Scores. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 1955, 2, 279-284.

Fey, William F. Acceptance of Self and Others, and Its Relation To Therapy-Readiness. Journal of Clinical Psychology. 1954, 10, 269-271.

_____. Acceptance by Others and Its Relation to Acceptance of Self and Others: A Re-evaluation. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 1955, 50, 274-276.

Jandt, Fred E. An Experimental Study of Self Concept and Satisfactions from Consummatory Communication. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio, 1970.

Maffeo, Gilbert J., Jr. and Paul D. Ware. Acceptance of Self and Others, Communication Denial and Alienation: An Experimental Study. Spring, 1971 (Unpublished manuscript.)

Phillips, E. Lakin. Attitudes Toward Self and Others: A Brief Questionnaire Report. Journal of Consulting Psychology. 1951, 15, 79-81.

Rogers, Carl R. Client-Centered Therapy: Its Current Practice, Implications, and Theory. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951.

Scher, Samuel Charles. Some Group Attitudes Related to Expressed Acceptance of Self and Others. Dissertation Abstracts. 1955, 15, 2579.

Shaw, Marvin E. and Jack M. Wright. Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.

Sheerer, Elizabeth T. An Analysis of the Relationship Between Acceptance of and Respect for Self and Acceptance of and Respect for Others in Ten Counseling Cases. Journal of Consulting Psychology. 1949, 13, 169-175.

Streitfeld, Julian W. Expressed Acceptance of Self and Others by Psychotherapists. Journal of Consulting Psychology. 1959, 23, 435-441.

Weiss, David J. Factor Analysis and Counseling Research. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 1970, 17, 477-485.

_____. Further Considerations in Applications of Factor Analysis. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 1971, 18, 85-92.

ABSTRACT

Berger's scale for expressed acceptance of others is based on statements describing behavior to others, particularly verbal behavior. Two separate factor analytic studies indicated that while the complete scale discriminates between males and females, three commonly shared factors exist paralleling three of Berger's original definition statements.

OS 500 181